

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Factors influencing the integration of planetary health topics into undergraduate medical education in Ireland: a qualitative study of medical educator perspectives
AUTHORS	Brady Bates, Oisin; Walsh, Aisling; Stanistreet, Debbi

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Moro, Christian Bond University, Faculty of Health Sciences and Medicine
REVIEW RETURNED	27-Sep-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Review of Barriers and facilitators to the integration of planetary health topics into undergraduate medical education: an exploratory study of medical educator perspectives.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to review this article for BMJ Open. It is a timely topic, and an interesting read. However, I have some suggestions for the author's consideration prior to recommending for publication.</p> <p>Introduction: The introduction is broken up into paragraphs, but many are quite short. The Planetary Health in medical education appears is a titled paragraph with only 2 sentences. This introduction section should be structured in larger paragraphs and subheadings used to break up larger content areas.</p> <p>The rationale for this study is unclear. The introduction mentions that this is the first in Ireland. Is there an expectation that Ireland would be different, or is the lack of local evidence the driver for the study? This content would be a good addition to the introduction, as the end of the discussion and conclusions sections certainly focus on Ireland. In fact, the nationwide focus does convert this from being quite limited (due to single-site design) to becoming quite strong, as it does focus on a specific region. If this becomes the focus, perhaps introducing “Ireland” into the title would also be helpful for the readers.</p> <p>References: As the article has quite a short introduction and discussion, 53 references does seem excessive. In some cases, a number of references have been merged (i.e. 5-7, 10-12, 20-23) which increase the number of refs but do not really help the reader identify the important concepts presented. I would consider reducing the references. On the other hand, there might be some value in incorporating citations for where planetary health concepts have been incorporated within curricula. Just to provide an example, this is one of our group's new studies, but could be</p>
-------------------------	---

	<p>relevant: Embedding planetary health concepts in a pre-medical physiology subject (https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2022.2118041), especially for the Planetary Health in Medical Education section.</p> <p>The Limitations section sentence: “Nevertheless, it echoes the findings of similar studies conducted in the United Kingdom (UK) (24), (25)” is really something that should be in the discussion. Better to simply state the limitations in this section, and justify the validity of the data in the main discussion.</p> <p>In its current form, the study would not be able to be reproduced. Were the interviews structured in a way that each participant received the same questions or queries? What were these questions? There needs to be more information on the interview process and procedures. How were the questions validated? How was bias from the interviewer considered?</p>
--	--

REVIEWER	Ajuebor, Onyema World Health Organization, Health Workforce
REVIEW RETURNED	03-Oct-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This is currently a hot topic in the medical education discourse. The authors are commended for seeking research solutions. Planetary health is a complex phenomenon and the same can be said for the mechanisms needed to effectively teach it in health training institutions. I draw your reference to the following publications https://doi.org/10.1093/heapro/daac086 and https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196(21)00110-8 I find the sample size and participant representation (with reference to the low participation of non-clinical staff) to be distorted in drawing a comprehensive conclusion on the barriers and facilitators for integrating planetary health into medical education as a whole. it is a limitation that is worth mentioning. After going through the paper, I find that the facilitators are listed and discussed as a mirrored reversal of the barriers. This adds a lot of redundancy and the two terms can be merged into one term, say "factors" for instance, and then merge the tables and the subsequent discussion themes - this should also be reflected in the title and it is important to also reflect at title level that the perspectives is of medical educators in RCSI specifically. Finally, the recommendations at the end of the manuscript are not necessarily specific to planetary health and can be applied for other contested subjects as well. Highlighting the specific characteristics of planetary health that will facilitate their integration and eventual successful practice will do a lot more to make the findings more significant. For instance, what should the educators be taught? Is there a specific way to embed or spiral planetary health courses into the medical curriculum?</p>
-------------------------	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1 – Dr. Christian Moro – Bond University

Reviewer feedback	Changes made by author
1. This introduction section should be structured in larger paragraphs and subheadings used to break up larger content areas.	Introduction has been reformatted into larger paragraphs under subheadings.
2. The rationale for this study is unclear. The introduction mentions that this is the first in Ireland. Is there an expectation that Ireland would be different, or is the lack of local evidence the driver for the study? This content would be a good addition to the introduction	Subheading added to introduction “Planetary health in Ireland” that addresses this suggestion. Discusses how this adds to the impact of the research in a local context.
3. As the article has quite a short introduction and discussion, 53 references does seem excessive	References reduced from 56 to 52.
4. On the other hand, there might be some value in incorporating citations for where planetary health concepts have been incorporated within curricula	Suggested paper from the author added, other papers that address current, in addition paper that details “planetary health report card” for medical curriculum in Ireland added.
5. The Limitations section sentence: “Nevertheless, it echoes the findings of similar studies conducted in the United Kingdom (UK) (24), (25)” is really something that should be in the discussion.	Sentence removed from the limitations section and moved to the discussion. Additional limitations added
6. In its current form, the study would not be able to be reproduced. There needs to be more information on the interview process and procedures	Subheading added to the methods section “The interview process”. Explained the rationale for the semi-structured interviews and provided the interview topics guide to aid in reproducibility of the study

Reviewer 2 - Dr. Onyema Ajuebor, World Health Organization

Reviewer Feedback	Changes Made
1. I find the sample size and participant representation (with reference to the low participation of non-clinical staff) to be distorted in drawing a comprehensive conclusion on the barriers and facilitators for integrating planetary health into medical education as a whole. it is a limitation that is worth mentioning.	Limitation added to the “Limitations” section

2. After going through the paper, I find that the facilitators are listed and discussed as a mirrored reversal of the barriers. This adds a lot of redundancy and the two terms can be merged into one term, say "factors" for instance, and then merge the tables and the subsequent discussion themes	Barriers and facilitators merged into "factors" discussion and table rewritten to reflect this change
3. Finally, the recommendations at the end of the manuscript are not necessarily specific to planetary health and can be applied for other contested subjects as well. Highlighting the specific characteristics of planetary health that will facilitate their integration and eventual successful practice will do a lot more to make the findings more significant. For instance, what should the educators be taught? Is there a specific way to embed or spiral planetary health courses into the medical curriculum?	Specific examples provided in the recommendations section. In particular the "educate the educators" subheading and the "embed into existing curriculum" subheading

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Moro, Christian Bond University, Faculty of Health Sciences and Medicine
REVIEW RETURNED	10-Nov-2022
GENERAL COMMENTS	I thank the author for considering the suggestions from the past review process, and am content that all of my concerns have been addressed.